

**LASVET**  
**Patent and Trademark Agency**  
Established 1992

March 28, 2003

Ms. Susan Ungar  
Primary Patent Examiner  
Group Art Unit: 1642  
USPTO

YOUR REF: 09/885,645

OUR REF: 0968/P/JO

**OFFICIAL****FAX RECEIVED**

MAR 28 2003

**GROUP 1600**

**Re: U.S. Patent Application No. 09/885,645 filed on June 20, 2001**  
**For: Method of treatment of malignant neoplasms and complex preparation**  
**having antineoplastic activity**

Dear Ms. Susan Ungar,

We are a Patent and Trademark Agency in Estonia, representing the applicants of the above patent application before USPTO. This is our first experience with USPTO.

We contact you directly for the reason that the response to the first Office Action filed with USPTO on October 31, 2002 remained without our explanation and objection as to the ground of rejection under MPEP § 806.05(h) arisen in the said Action. The objections, basing on MPEP § 803 and § 821.04, were not presented by us and this is not our vision of the case.

This time the response to the second Office Action filed with USPTO on March 21, 2003 has been prepared by us together with the applicants in such a form as we consider the problems under the question. The applicants have taken into account the advices and have attempted to respond to the rejections arisen.

Therefore we herewith again respectfully request you to reconsider the restriction requirement under § 806.05(h) in light of the explanations presented in the said response.

Very truly yours,

Milvi Vänikver

Please kindly confirm the receipt of this facsimile.